

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

TARAS KRYSA,  
Plaintiff(s),

v.

STATE OF NEVADA, et al.,  
Defendant(s).

Case No.: 2:20-cv-00106-JCM-NJK

**Order**

[Docket Nos. 22, 24]

Pending before the Court is Defendant UNLV's proposed discovery plan and a joint status report. Docket Nos. 22, 24.

Plaintiff has declined to engage in a Rule 26(f) conference, asserting that discovery should not proceed in light of the pending motion to remand. *See* Docket No. 24 at 2. The pendency of a motion to remand is not generally cause to stay discovery. *E.g. Anoruo v. Valley Health Sys., LLC*, 2018 WL 1785866, at \*3 (D. Nev. Apr. 13, 2018).<sup>1</sup> No justification has been provided to chart a different course here. Moreover, the Court generally prefers not to enter a scheduling order when a proper Rule 26(f) conference has not occurred.

---

<sup>1</sup> To the extent reasonable grounds exist to stay discovery in this case, a proper motion must be filed explaining how the governing standards are satisfied. The filing of that motion does not impact the requirements established herein to conduct a Rule 26(f) conference and file a joint proposed discovery plan.

1 Accordingly, Defendant's proposed discovery plan is **DENIED** without prejudice. The  
2 parties must engage in a Rule 26(f) conference by May 1, 2020. The parties must file a joint  
3 proposed discovery plan by May 7, 2020.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: April 28, 2020

6  
7   
8 \_\_\_\_\_  
9 Nancy J. Koppe  
10 United States Magistrate Judge  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28